

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is prepared in reply to the Office action mailed on 19 March 2007 (Paper No. 07).

No claim amendments are made by this response. Thus, claims 25-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 25-28, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for the reasons stated in sections 3 and 4 on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Namely, the Examiner alleges that "transmitting no cell cessation alarm information to the corresponding mobile station upon a determination that the mobile station is not registered in the private radio mobile communications system" is not supported in the specification.

However, in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16 of the present application, it is stated that "When the call is an extension call between the registered subscribers [such as between registered mobile stations], the cell cessation alarm operation and process shown in Fig 2 is performed. Otherwise, when the call is not an extension call between the registered subscribers, a handoff occurs to a neighbor BTS, such as BTS₈₁, upon detection of the occurrence or expected occurrence of the cell cessation."

Thus, it is inherent in the quotation noted above that information for generating an

alarm is transmitted upon a determination that the mobile station is registered whereas a different procedure is performed upon a determination that the mobile station is not registered.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 25-28 and 30 meet all of the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and are supported by the specification.

Claims 25-30 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Buttitta (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,166) in view of Bartle (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,655) for the reasons stated in sections 5 and 6 on pages 4-11 of the Office Action.

As noted in the last paragraph of page 5 of the Office Action, for example, the Examiner alleges that when "the mobile station (10) connects with the cellular system, the mobile station (10) is not registered (or connected) with the private base station. Therefore, the private base station does not just transmitted a warning tone to a mobile station not connected or registered. (Emphasis added)"

However, this does not correspond to the present recited invention in that it is inherent that the mobile station must be connected, that is, the first three recited limitations of claim 25, for example, require connection with the mobile station in order to determine frame quality and to determine whether the mobile station is registered in the private

wireless communications system.

Furthermore, if the mobile station 10 of Buttitta is not connected with the private base station, the system of Bartle cannot detect information about the frame quality or compare the frame quality information with a power control parameter value of the system since the mobile station 10 is not connected.

Thus, it would not be obvious to combine the two references since the resultant combination would be inoperative.

With regard to the rejection of claims 30 and 31, the Examiner, in the beginning of section 6 on page 10 of the Office Action indicates that claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as anticipated by Buttitta.

However, in the last paragraph on page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that regarding claim 31, "the combination of Buttitta and Bartle discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above".

Thus, it is unclear whether claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Buttitta or have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over the combination of Buttitta and Bartle.


In any event, the rejection of claims 30 and 31 have the same deficiency noted above with regard to the other rejected claims and accordingly, it is submitted that claims 30 and 31 are also patentable over the applied references, taken either alone or combination.

Accordingly, it is submitted that all of the present claims are patentable over the applied references, taken either alone or in combination and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Request for Reconsideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56258
Date: 6/18/07
I.D.: REB/HMZ